

**Exploring Students' Knowledge of and Attitudes Towards Hate
Speech at the Ohio State University**

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Bachelor of
Science in Social Work in the Honor's College of Social Work of The Ohio State
University

Thesis

By:

Anna Marie Riendeau

Undergraduate Program in Social Work

The Ohio State University

2013

Thesis Committee

Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda, advisor

Copyrighted By:

Anna Riendeau

2013

Abstract

In the past few years there has been an increase in hate speech incidents on the Ohio State University's main campus itself as well as in the media surrounding the university from racist vandalism on the black cultural center to xenophobic comments tweeted online by students and blasted on a haters tumblr. What is more, because Ohio State is such a diverse university and has locations across the world including India and China all recruiting international students, it is imperative that hate speech be investigated further. Even though some research on hate speech has been conducted, little of it takes place on college campuses and most of it is quantitative in nature.

The purpose of this research was to explore undergraduate students' knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech on the Ohio State University's main campus as well as to determine what measures they think the university should take in response to hate speech on campus. The research design for this study was qualitative, in-person interviewing. Eight participants were purposively selected and interviewed using an interview guide. Results found that undergraduate students were knowledgeable about what hate speech is, but uninformed about the Constitution's stance on hate speech. Additionally, undergraduate students were disapproving of hate speech, and all agreed that the university needs to do something about it.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my mother, Elizabeth Riendeau, my father, Gerard Riendeau, and my sister Rachel Riendeau for always loving, supporting, and believing in me even when I did not believe in myself. I could not have done it without you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of many individuals. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Sharavari Karandikar-Chheda, for her guidance and patience throughout this entire process. Second, I would like to thank Andréa Severson, Jennie Babcock, and the rest of the College of Social Work at The Ohio State University for providing me with the opportunity to do research as an undergraduate. Finally, I would like to thank those that talked with me and shared their thoughts and feelings about hate speech.

Vita

June 1997.....Our Lady of Bethlehem School and Childcare, Columbus, OH
June 2002.....St. Brendan's Elementary School, Hilliard, OH
June 2005.....John Sells Middle School, Dublin, OH
May 2009.....Jerome High School, Dublin, OH
May 2013.....The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

Fields of Study

Major Field: Social Work

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Dedication.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	5
Vita.....	6
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	9
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	12
2.1 Cowan and Mettrick (2002)	
2.2 Cowan, Resendez, Marshall, & Quist (2002)	
2.3 Dickter (2002)	
2.4 Hatfield, Schafer, & Stroup (2005)	
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	16
3.1 Research Design	
3.2 Data Collection	
3.3 Analysis	
3.4 Limitations of the Methodology	
3.5 Strengths of the Methodology	
Chapter 4: Results.....	19
4.1 Demographics	
4.2 Knowledge of Hate Speech	
4.3 Knowledge of Hate Speech and the Constitution of the United States	
4.4 Personally Experienced and/or Witnessed Hate Speech	

4.5 Responses to Personally Experiencing and/or Witnessing Hate Speech	
4.6 OSU Haters Tumblr	
4.7 The Ohio State University’s Response	
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	27
5.1 Knowledge of Hate Speech	
5.2 Attitudes Towards Hate Speech	
5.3 What Measures Should Be Taken by the University in Response to Hate Speech	
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	29
Appendix A.....	31
Verbal Recruitment Script	
Appendix B.....	33
Consent to Participate in Research	
Appendix C.....	38
Interview Guide	
References.....	40

Chapter 1: Introduction

In the past few years there has been an increase in hate speech incidents on the Ohio State University's main campus itself as well as in the media surrounding the university. On Monday, January 23, 2012 an advertisement was published in *The Lantern* that read "Former Leaders of the Muslim Student Association (MSA): Where are they now?" (Jones, 2012; Lantern Staff, 2012; Sheikh, 2012b). In an attempt to sell a pamphlet entitled "Muslim Hate Groups on Campus" by Daniel Greenfield, it went on to list individuals, who had been presidents in Muslim Student Association organizations at various universities across the country during their time at college and now have ties to terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda and al-Shabab (Jones, 2012; Lantern Staff, 2012; Sheikh, 2012b). Later that same year, on Wednesday, October 24, 2012 another advertisement was published in *The Lantern* that read "The Deadly Threat of a Nuclear-Armed Iran: What can the world, what can the USA, what can Israel do about it?" (The Ohio State University's Muslim Student Association, 2012; Spencer, 2012b). Published by Facts and Logistics About the Middle East, it asserted that "...Iranians and other Muslims are crazies...", and they "...take instructions directly from Allah, who tells them to kill the Jews and other infidels, whatever the cost" (The Ohio State University's Muslim Student Association, 2012; Spencer, 2012b).

In terms of vandalism, on the morning of Thursday, April 5, 2012, it was discovered that someone had spray-painted "Long Live Zimmerman" on Hale Hall, which is home to the Frank W. Hale Jr. Black Cultural Center (Bradley, 2012). The very next day graffiti was discovered off-campus at the corner of 11th Ave. and 4th St. with three swastikas and the word "n-----s"

spray-painted on a mural of President Obama (Sheikh, 2012a). Less than two weeks later, on Monday, April 16, 2012, two more incidents occurred (Castle, 2012). First the word “n-----s” and a swastika were written in permanent marker on a dry-erase board hanging on a residence hall room door in Baker Hall East, and second, the phrase “hang n-----s” was spray-painted on a dumpster across from the union behind Formaggio Pizza at 20 E. 13th Ave. (Castle, 2012). In response to all of these events, the twitter account @OSU_Haters and corresponding OSU Haters Tumblr were established in May 2012 by an anonymous group of students (Williams, 2012). The twitter retweets tweets by OSU students that it deems to be hateful, while the tumblr posts pictures of the tweets (Williams, 2012). The OSU Haters Tumblr profile reads, “Ohio State is no place for hate. We expose tweets from haters here, especially those which were deleted” (Williams, 2012).

Hate speech at the Ohio State University’s main campus is problematic because as of October 2012 11,332 (or approximately 26%) of undergraduate students out of 43,508 total undergraduate students on the Ohio State University’s main campus were minorities based on either their race and/or ethnicity or their status as an international student (Crisan-Vandeborne, 2012, p. 3). Additionally, because Ohio State is an internationally renowned university with Global Gateways in Shanghai, China (February 2010) and Mumbai, India (February 2012) to recruit international students and has plans to open a Gateway office in São Paulo, Brazil by 2014 as well as in Turkey, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Europe in the long-term future, it is imperative that hate speech be investigated further (Gateways).

The rationale for this study was to add depth to the limited research on hate speech at the Ohio State University's main campus as well as to explore undergraduate students' knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech. This study also makes recommendations for the Ohio State University administration to make changes around campus in order to prevent and respond to hate speech.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

When it comes to existing knowledge and previous work on hate speech, little research has been done, especially on college campuses. Additionally, the research that has been done is primarily quantitative in nature. This section will go over the research that has been conducted and review the literature that has been published about hate speech in the last eleven years.

2.1 Cowan and Mettrick (2002)

In 2002, a study by Cowan and Mettrick looked at perceptions of hate speech in a college setting. Eight different scenarios involving hate speech were used where the target of speech (African Americans, women, or homosexuals), the behavioral response of the target (response or no response), the emotional response of the target (calm or afraid), and the setting (public or private) were varied. The study found that if the target responded fearfully, ratings of offensiveness and harmfulness towards the target as well as accountability of the speaker were strongest, while a calm response of filing a complaint was seen as the most appropriate (Cowan & Mettrick, 2002).

2.2 Cowan, Resendez, Marshall, & Quist (2002)

Later that same year (2002), a study by Cowan, Resendez, Marshall, & Quist looked at the effects of priming for freedom of speech versus priming for equal-protection. College students were placed into one of three conditions (two priming and one control, non-priming). Both of the priming conditions were given a definition of hate speech, a statement regarding either the First Amendment or the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, and questions

about either the importance of freedom of speech/costs of censorship or the harm of hate speech/benefits of limiting hate speech, while the non-priming condition was given nothing. Afterwards, all participants were asked to complete a value survey in order to determine their ranking of freedom and equality as well as the Harm and Freedom of Speech Scales, which measures attitudes towards freedom of speech/costs of censorship and the harm of hate speech/benefits of limiting speech. Finally, participants also responded to six hate speech scenarios involving homosexual, Black, or female targets. The study found that participants primed for freedom of speech viewed hate speech as less harmful than those primed for equal-protection and a control group (Cowan, Resendez, Marshall, & Quist, 2002).

2.3 Dickter (2002)

Still another study looked at the variables that influence non-targets' verbal and non-verbal reactions and/or responses to heterosexist comments (Dickter, 2002). First, college students were asked to complete the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays Scale, identify how many of their closest friends were homosexual, and estimate the number of negative comments they hear during a typical week regarding sexual orientation. During the next week they were asked to observe their surroundings and note situations involving negative comments made about an individual's or a group's sexual orientation, but the comment had to be made in their presence by another person rather than on television, in a movie, etc. Since the study was conducted online, they were then asked to go onto the survey website, log two incidents (provide detailed information about the comment itself, identify who said it, and describe the situation), and answer some questions about each incident (offensiveness of the comment, their reaction emotionally and otherwise, verbal and non-verbal confronting/non-confronting behavior, and

excuses made for not confronting). Also, they were told if they did not witness two incidents, then to report on a recent experience. The study found that heterosexist comments are very much prevalent on college campuses. The offensiveness of the comment, social pressure to confront, and the number of homosexual friends predict the likelihood of confronting the perpetrator. In the end, those who confronted the perpetrator felt more satisfied with their response than those who did not confront the perpetrator (Dickter, 2002).

2.4 Hatfield, Schafer, & Stroup (2005)

Finally, in 2005 a study looked at the effects of engaging college students in dialogue about hate speech (Hatfield, Schafer, & Stroup). First, students were given a pretest comprised of six scenarios involving hate speech and asked to answer how appropriate they perceived the message (inappropriate, uncertain, appropriate) and their reaction to the scenario (do/say nothing, talk to a friend about the situation, report the situation to some higher authority, verbally confront the perpetrator/s). Afterwards, they attended the keynote address given for a special conference held on campus to address issues of hate speech. The speaker, Gail Stern of the Anti-Defamation League's regional office in Chicago, introduced various forms of hateful discourse and the effect of hateful messages on individuals and society. Following the keynote, students participated in discussion groups lead by a graduate teaching assistant, where they had the opportunity to express reactions to the keynote address and engage in a dialogue about their perceptions of hate speech issues on campus. In the end, the students took a posttest, which had the same scenarios and questions as the pretest but in a different order. The study found that when students were engaged in discourse about hate speech and its negative impacts, their sense of appropriateness of hate speech messages decreased and the overtness of their reaction to hate

speech messages increased (Hatfield, Schafer, & Stroup, 2005).

Chapter 3: Methodology

This section will discuss the research design, data collection, analysis, limitations and strengths of the methodology in order to provide the reader with an understanding how the research was conducted.

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study was qualitative using in-depth interviewing that attempted to fulfill the research objectives, which were to:

- 1) Explore undergraduate students' knowledge of hate speech on the Ohio State University's main campus
- 2) Explore undergraduate students' attitudes towards hate speech on the Ohio State University's main campus
- 3) Explore what measures undergraduate students think should be taken by the Ohio State University in response to hate speech on campus

3.2 Data Collection

In-person interviews were used to explore undergraduate students' knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech at the Ohio State University's main campus. After receiving consent from the Ohio State University Institutional Research Board, undergraduate students were purposively selected from diverse backgrounds (e.g. racial and/or ethnic identities, gender identities, etc.) at various on-campus locations including the Ohio Union, the 18th Avenue Library, the Central Classroom Building, and the Recreation and Physical Activity Center (RPAC). Using a verbal

script (Appendix A), the students were informed of the purpose of the study, possible benefits/risks, and length and time frame. They were also notified that participation is voluntary and all responses are anonymous. Participants were then given the contact information of the investigator so that an interview could be set for a later date and time. Before the interview participants signed a form of informed consent (Appendix B) acknowledging that they knew and understood the risks of the study, while during the interview an interview guide (Appendix C) was used.

3.3 Analysis

For analysis all of the interviews were transcribed, and the researcher made additional notes and observations of the interviewees. Demographics were recorded in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and common themes were identified. In total, eight students were interviewed.

3.4 Limitations of the Methodology

There were several limitations of the methodology. First, the study only included undergraduate students at the Ohio State University's main campus, so graduate students, faculty/staff members, and students at satellite campuses were all excluded. In the beginning of the study faculty/staff members at the Ohio State University's main campus were going to be included but were unable to be due to time constraints. Second, purposive sampling was used, which has the potential to introduce sampling bias because the people who participated may already have strong opinions against hate speech, while those who perpetuate hate speech may be less likely to participate if at all.

3.5 Strengths of the Methodology

On the other hand, there were also several strengths of the methodology. With the smaller sample size, the data analysis portion was more in depth. Second, because the study was qualitative in nature and used in-person interviews, it allowed for participants to be subjective and open in their answers.

Chapter 4: Results

The results from this study are organized into categories based upon the common themes that emerged from the interviews. These categories include demographics, knowledge of hate speech, personally experienced and/or witnessed hate speech, responses to personally experiencing and/or witnessing hate speech, OSU Haters Tumblr, and the Ohio State University's Response.

4.1 Demographics

Out of 8 participants 5 were female and 3 were male. The average age of the participants was 20 with the range being 18-28. All participants were mentally and physically abled.

Race and/or Ethnicity	Sexual Orientation	Country of Origin	Major*	Spiritual/Religious Affiliation	Political Ideology	Year in School	Rural, Urban, or Suburban	Diversity in Hometown
Caucasian 3	Straight 5	USA 6	Psychology 2	Christian 3	Democrat 6	Sophomore 3	Suburban 5	No 5
Asian 3	Gay 2	India 1	Political Science 2	Other 2	Republican 1	Junior 3	Urban 3	Yes 3
African American 1	Bisexual 1	Korea 1	Business 1	None 2	Other 1	Freshman 2		
Two or More Races 1			Communications 1	Muslim 1				
			Animal Sciences 1					
			Public Affairs 1					
			Chinese 1					
			International Studies 1					

* Two participants were double majoring

4.2 Knowledge of Hate Speech

When participants were asked what hate speech is, almost all of them mentioned one or more categories of diversity (i.e. race and/or ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, etc.). Three

participants specifically used the word “minority”, while two others indirectly referenced it using the words “social group” or “group of people”. Four participants expressed that hate speech has to do with communication either written or verbal, while four participants (not necessarily the same four) alluded to the idea that hate speech has to do with power to “intimidate”, “put down”, “single out”, and “defame”. Three participants talked about hate speech being against someone’s “identity”, “who they are”, or “difference”. Other words used to describe hate speech were “derogatory”, “offensive”, and “negative”.

4.3 Knowledge of Hate Speech and the Constitution of the United States

When asked about the Constitution’s stance on hate speech, four participants explicitly said they did “not know”, were “unsure”, or were “unaware”. Two participants, both political science majors, said that hate speech was not constitutionally protected under the first amendment of freedom of speech meaning that people can be prosecuted for hate speech, while two other participants cited freedom of speech when it comes to hate speech. Sarah*, who is a political science major, made an interesting point when she said, “The Civil Rights movement was only fifty years ago, so when you look at the way that our generation our culture is reading and defining hate speech it’s almost kind of a new aspect of speech that I think we’re trying to pay attention to that we haven’t paid attention to in the past.”

4.4 Personally Experienced and/or Witnessed Hate Speech

When asked whether they had ever personally experienced and/or witnessed hate speech on the

**All names have been changed because participants selected pseudonyms*

Ohio State University's main campus, four participants mentioned the vandalism on the Hale Center; however, one participant named Rasmus was reluctant to label it as hate speech because he said, "I think hate speech is a very serious accusation that I don't think is forgivable." Rather he would call what was written on the Hale Center prejudicial speech that betrays a bias because it was "not explicitly directed towards a group", and "there is room for interpretation as to what the writer's intention was".

Three participants shared personal stories of hate speech. First, Jay talked about how he was recently walking from Morrison Tower to the Union, and as he was walking by Catfish Biff, a group of guys sitting in a car were telling some sort of joke amongst themselves but loud enough for him to hear they called him a "f---t". Second, Noel talked about the anti-Asian sentiments in her residence hall because she lives in an academic-year, first-year building that houses a lot of the international freshmen. Her roommates and people living on her floor will make racist comments and say things like, "Oh all the Asians they just need to go away, they're so loud, they're so annoying, they're always in the study room" essentially acting like no one wants them living there. Third, Sarah talked about how just the other day she was sitting at the Union, and a guy was talking on the phone in Arabic when a girl next to her rolled her eyes and whispered the word "terrorist" under her breath. Finally, two participants, one an international student and one a recent transfer student, said no when asked if they had ever personally experienced and/or witnessed hate speech on the Ohio State University's main campus.

4.5 Responses to Personally Experiencing and/or Witnessing Hate Speech

When participants, who mentioned the Hale Center as hate speech, were asked about their responses to the incident, one participant admitted to putting it all over her social media platforms as well as talking about it in her residence hall and with her peers, while another participant, studying public affairs, said some of her classes had discussions about the offensiveness of the message versus freedom of speech. Both participants talked about the student body's response in terms of the OSU Stand Your Ground Movement and the No Place for Hate task force that followed.

On Friday, April 6, 2012, one day after the vandalism on the Hale Center, approximately 170 students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community members, wearing all black, marched in a single-file line from the Hale Center to the Longaberger Alumni House, where a Board of Trustees meeting was being held (Essig, 2012a; Spencer, 2012a). Upon arriving, the group demanded that the university implement hate crime alerts, increase diversity of students and faculty, and strive for inclusion, not just tolerance (Essig, 2012a; Spencer, 2012a). President Gee in turn appointed Dr. Javaune Adams-Gaston, vice president of student life, and Dr. Valerie Lee, vice provost for diversity and inclusion and chief diversity officer, with the role of forming a task group called No Place for Hate in order to generate solutions in the coming weeks (Essig, 2012b; Spencer, 2012a).

Another participant said that she was a reporter at *The Lantern* at the time of the vandalism on the Hale Center, so her main goal was to report about it by getting the word out and making sure that people were aware of what was happening. In her words, “unless people know that [hate

speech] does happen nothing can be done about it”. Overall, participants expressed feeling “upset”, “shocked”, and “mad”, while two participants specifically used the word “unrest” to describe campus in the succeeding weeks.

Georgia, an African American participant, said that she did not necessarily feel endangered or threatened by what was written on the Hale Center but rather disrespected. She thought that the person behind it was trying to be funny but dumb, acting out, and ignorant in that he/she was probably neither one to put himself/herself in another person’s shoes nor someone who had African American friends. If given the opportunity to do it over, Georgia said she probably would have been more involved by going to more protests and working with people to try and figure stuff out as opposed to being semi-involved.

When participants, who shared personal stories, were asked about their responses to the incidents, all said they had responded. First, Jay said he went up to the guys’ car and asked them to repeat the joke, but they were unwilling to do so. He said that he was surprised and disappointed because that had not happened to him on campus for a while, but he is used to that sort of treatment from people, and it is something that he has come to expect. However, he would not have handled it any differently. Second, Noel said that she has told her roommates and people living on her floor, “You don’t really know [the Asian, international students], you need to get to know them, and you’re really stereotyping them. You need to treat them as people. If they’re doing something that annoys you, don’t say it annoys you cause they’re Asian. It annoys you because they’re being loud not because they’re Asian.” She then went on to say that it does upset her because she knows that a lot of times people do not take the time to get to know others.

Nevertheless, she also understands where her roommates and people living on her floor are coming from because she has tried to talk to the Asian, international students before, but they were rude and just mainly keep to themselves. Third, Sarah said she turned to the girl and said, “Excuse me?!” because she was offended and angered by what the girl had said as well as completely shocked and taken aback. She said that she froze up because she is involved in a lot of groups that are diverse, so she is not used to when people are not open to other cultures. If she could go back she is not sure what she would have said or done differently because she was in no way, shape, or form prepared to act differently.

4.6 OSU Haters Tumblr

When asked if they were familiar with the OSU Haters Tumblr, five participants said yes, while three participants said no. Of the five participants who said they were familiar with the tumblr, one participant agreed with its goal to expose tweets from haters, while the other four participants had mixed feelings about it. The participant who said that she agreed with its goal to expose tweets from haters said that people deserve to get called out because “free speech isn’t free of judgment”. Another participant, who said that she had mixed feelings about its goal to expose tweets from haters, said that some of the things on the tumblr are taken out of context especially because a lot of times people on twitter are either venting or joking and do not intend for their tweets to be taken the way they are being taken. Additionally, she described it as ineffective because all it does is “purposefully expose someone to other people’s hate. And those people who are trying to do good by reading the OSU Haters [Tumblr] are becoming haters”. Following are some of the other responses from participants, who had mixed feelings about the OSU Haters Tumblr’s goal to expose tweets from haters:

“I don’t believe in feeding the trolls... I think it’s important to recognize that [hate speech] exists, and it exists rampantly. But at the same time I feel like when you give things a lot of attention that way, it glorifies the act.” – Jay

“[I think it’s] good for holding people accountable but hateful [at the same time]. [I mean] who determines hate speech?” – Maria

“I [do] think to some extent it “brings” a lot of attention to the people that “are” posting the tweets... I think something that our generation doesn’t understand is that when you put something on the Internet, it’s on the Internet for everyone to see, and you have to be really careful what you’re posting – like that.” – Sarah

4.7 The Ohio State University’s Response

When participants were asked what measures they thought should be taken by the university in response to hate speech on campus (if any), they all agreed that something needed to be done. Two participants talked about having conversations surrounding hate speech in terms of “[encouraging] open communication” and “[promoting] dialogue on what exactly is hate speech” in order to come up with a workable definition because before you can take action for or against something, you have to “know what it is and really understand it”. Three participants talked about education in terms of “increas[ing] diversity and build[ing] relationships between students”, “diversity programs”, and “providing the tools for students to experience and embrace diversity and understand that differences are not a bad thing”. One of the participants was

skeptical about the existing first year experience programs and diversity programs in the residence halls because a lot of times the programs are optional, so if you do not want to go to them you do not have to. Thus, the people who would be affected by the programs are most likely not choosing to go to them. Four participants talked about the university's response to hate speech incidents in terms of providing counseling and support to victims of hate speech, utilizing hate crime alerts, and acknowledging that hate speech is going on but that the Ohio State University neither condones nor will stand for hate speech – possibly through a newsletter or email from President Gee or Dr. Adams-Gaston. Three participants talked about action that the university should take against those who perpetuate hate speech. Georgia felt that a person could not be punished for hate speech unless there was a violent act attached to it such as if someone was physically hurting someone else. Jay felt that if the hate speech could be connected to a specific individual or group of people they should be penalized to some extent – possibly suspension for a semester, but he was very adamant about how “[not] all hate speech is equal” because it depends on various factors including whether it was malicious and intended to hurt someone, whether it affects someone's life personally, whether the person was just trying to be funny and tell a joke, etc. Jerry felt that expulsion and not allowing the person to continue his/her education would be an appropriate response because Ohio State University is a community and has a reputation to uphold, and when someone at OSU perpetuates hate speech, it soils that reputation. Additionally, Jerry served in the military for eight years, where you do not have freedom of speech, and he felt that people in the United States get away with a lot more than they should.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This section will discuss the results from the study in relation to the research objectives, which were to explore undergraduate students' knowledge of hate speech, attitudes towards hate speech, and what measures they think should be taken by the university in response to hate speech on campus.

5.1 Knowledge of Hate Speech

From speaking with undergraduate students it is clear that there is no set definition of hate speech; however, by combining what all of the participants said together into one definition, hate speech could be defined as:

Communication that is negative, derogatory, and offensive in nature, which is written or spoken with the intent of disempowering an individual or minority group, based upon their identity, who they are, or categories of difference (i.e. race and/or ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, etc.)

In addition, participants were split when it came to the Constitution's stance on hate speech. Five participants had no idea, while two participants said that hate speech is not constitutionally protected and two other participants said that hate speech is protected under the first amendment of freedom of speech.

5.2 Attitudes Towards Hate Speech

In terms of attitudes towards hate speech, the undergraduate students I spoke with all expressed disfavor. Half of the participants, who referred to the vandalism on the Hale Center as an

example of hate speech, said they felt “upset”, “shocked”, and “mad”, while two participants described a general feeling of “unrest” on campus in the weeks following the vandalism. The participants, who shared personal stories, said they felt “surprised”, “disappointed”, “upset”, “offended”, “angered”, and “taken aback” when they personally experienced and/or witnessed hate speech.

5.3 What Measures Should Be Taken by the University in Response to Hate Speech

With regard to measures that should be taken by the university in response to hate speech, the undergraduate students I spoke with all agreed that the university needs to do something. Some participants suggested having conversations around hate speech, affording opportunities for education about diversity, providing counseling and support to victims of hate speech, utilizing hate crime alerts, and acknowledging hate speech when it happens but that the university will neither condone nor stand for it. However, when it came to action that the university should take against those who perpetuate hate speech, participants’ answers were all over the place. One participant said that unless violence was involved people could not be punished for hate speech, a second participant said that people who perpetuate hate speech should be suspended for a semester, and yet another participant said that people who perpetuate hate speech should be expelled.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This research study explored undergraduate students' knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech at the Ohio State University's main campus as well as determined what measures they think the university should take in response to hate speech on campus. The researcher reviewed existing literature on hate speech, developed an interview guide, and conducted in-person interviews. Results indicated that for the most part undergraduate students were fairly knowledgeable about what hate speech is considering there is no set definition, but they were ignorant when it came to the Constitution's stance on hate speech. Undergraduate students also expressed strong feelings of disfavor when it came to attitudes towards hate speech. Finally, undergraduate students all agreed that the university needs to step up in response to hate speech. This study is crucial because it has the potential to change how the university functions as a whole as well as change students' and faculty/staff members' experiences at the Ohio State University. It is essential that social workers initiate these changes by advocating for dialogue surrounding hate speech as well as education about diversity to take place at all levels of the university. Furthermore, social workers need to be part of the first responders when hate speech incidents do occur in order to provide counseling and support to victims of hate speech.

In terms of future research, more studies about hate speech are necessary in order to fully comprehend and successfully respond to incidents of hate speech. Some of these studies include: an exploratory study that looks at the role of social media (i.e. Twitter, Facebook, Youtube, etc.) with regards to hate speech; a descriptive study that looks at what factors make someone likely to perpetuate hate speech; an explanatory study that

looks at the effects of a program, which attempts to prevent hate speech incidents on college campuses; and an explanatory study that looks at the effects of a program, which attempts to respond to hate speech incidents on college campuses. Although the issue of hate speech will never be solved, it is vital for an academic institution as large and diverse as the Ohio State University to pioneer the way in scholarly discussions concerning hate speech and responding appropriately to incidents of hate speech.

Appendix A

Verbal Recruitment Script

My name is Anna Riendeau, and I am from the College of Social Work and conducting a study to understand hate speech at the Ohio State University for my senior honors thesis.

The interview is quite lengthy and will last approximately 30-45 minutes. It includes questions about your knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech on the Ohio State University's main campus. Your participation in this study is very valuable and sharing your experiences and thoughts will be very helpful to me and other researchers and organizations studying hate speech. You will be reimbursed with a \$10 Starbucks gift card for participating in the study. With your permission, I would like to audiotape the interview. However, if you do not wish to be audiotaped I will not use the tape recorder and will conduct the interview without audiotaping.

Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you will not be penalized or lose benefits if you refuse to participate or decide to stop. During the interview, you can refuse to answer any question or stop at any point in time.

If you are interested in participating in this study or have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study here is a copy of my contact information as well as the contact information of my thesis advisor:

Knowledge of and Attitudes towards Hate Speech at The Ohio State University

Researcher:

Anna Riendeau

College of Social Work

riendeau.6@osu.edu

(614) 284-5457

Thesis Advisor:

Dr. Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda

College of Social Work

karandikar-chheda.1@osu.edu

(614) 495-6408

Appendix B

Consent to Participate in Research

I am a researcher from the Ohio State University, College of Social Work, and I am doing this project as my senior honors thesis. I am conducting a study on undergraduate students and faculty/staff members' knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech on the Ohio State University's main campus. This study seeks to understand what measures undergraduate students and faculty/staff members think should be taken by OSU in response to hate speech on campus. It also has the potential to benefit the general field of knowledge when it comes to hate speech.

You can refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation in this study is *voluntary*.

The interview is quite lengthy and will last approximately 30-45 minutes. The interview includes questions about your knowledge of and your attitudes towards hate speech on campus as well as what measures you think OSU should take in response to hate speech on campus. It also includes some questions that you make consider to be sensitive information such as about your religion, sexual orientation, ability and/or disability status, etc.; however, you are free to choose not to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. I want to assure you that the information you provide will be kept confidential. The audio tapes will be destroyed once the interviews are transcribed and the data will be kept locked in the office of my thesis advisor, Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda, located in Stillman Hall, which is the College of Social Work. You will be reimbursed with a \$10 Starbucks gift card for participating in the study. With your permission, I would like to audiotape the interview. However, if you do not wish to be audiotaped I will not use the tape recorder and

will conduct the interview without audiotaping. Your participation in this study is very valuable and sharing your experiences and thoughts will be very helpful to me and other researchers studying hate speech research. There are some risks involved in participating in this study. The interview may cause minor psychological discomfort because you will be sharing information about your knowledge of and attitudes towards hate speech. Also, there are no immediate benefits for participating in the study.

I will be reporting findings from the interviews in research papers. However, your name and identity will ***not*** be included in these papers. I will ask you to pick a pseudo name for yourself, which will be used throughout the interview process and in the analysis of data. If you think you may have been injured from being in this study, please call Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda at (614) 495-6408. Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda can be reached at this number 24-hours a day.

If you have questions, concerns, complaints, or if you feel you have been harmed as a result of study participation, you can contact Sharvari Karandikar-Chheda at (614) 495-6408. I am also providing you with the contact information of my organization:

College Of Social Work

325X Stillman Hall

1947 College Road

Columbus, Ohio 43210

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Following is the contact information for Counseling and Consultation Services as well as the Multicultural Center, which are both places you can find support if you experience psychological discomfort as a result of participating in this study:

Counseling and Consultation Services

Monday to Thursday 8:00am – 8:00pm and Friday 8:00am – 5:00pm

4th Floor of the Younkin Success Center

1640 Neil Ave. Columbus, OH 43210

<http://www.ccs.osu.edu>

(614) 292-5766

Multicultural Center

Monday to Thursday 8:00am – 10:00pm and Friday 8:00am – 5:00pm

Suite 1000 in the Ohio Union

1739 N. High St. Columbus, OH 43210

<http://www.mcc.osu.edu>

(614) 688-8449

You can refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty of loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There is no charge for participating in this study. Signing this document means that the research study, including the above information, has been described to you orally, and that you voluntarily agree to participate.

I would like to ask your permission to participate in the study on hate speech at the Ohio State University. The information you provide here today will be kept confidential and you will have access to any summary reports written on the study's findings. The report will be available in Stillman Hall, which is the College of Social Work and will be mailed to you at your address upon request. You will be given a signed copy of this consent form. Please check the statement with which you agree.

☐ No, I do not wish to participate in this study

☐ Yes, I wish to participate in this study. The purpose of the study and the interview has been explained to me clearly and all of my questions have been answered. I know that my participation in this study is voluntary, that I can stop it anytime I wish, and that I can refuse to answer any of the questions asked of me.

Appendix C

Interview Guide

Demographics

1. What would you like your pseudonym to be?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your race and/or ethnicity?
4. What is your sexual orientation?
5. What is your country of origin?
6. What is your major?
7. What is your spiritual/religious affiliation?
8. What is your political ideology?
9. What is your year in school?
10. What is your age?
11. What is your ability and/or disability status?
12. Did you grow up in a rural, urban, or suburban setting?
13. Was there a lot of diversity in your hometown?

Questions

1. According to you, what is hate speech?
2. What is the Constitution's stance on hate speech?
3. Have you ever personally experienced and/or witnessed an instance of hate speech on OSU's main campus?

4. If so, what did you/didn't you say or do? Why or why not? How did it make you feel and why? Would you have handled it any differently than you did if given the opportunity?
5. Are you familiar with the OSU Haters Tumblr?
6. If so, do you agree with its goal to "expose tweets from haters"? Why or why not?
7. What measures do you think should be taken by the Ohio State University in response to hate speech on campus (if any)?

References

- Bradley, T. (2012, April 4). 'Long Live Zimmerman' on Hale Hall, Ohio State's black cultural center. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/campus/long-live-zimmerman-on-hale-hall-ohio-state-s-black-cultural-center-1.2840151>
- Castle, C. (2012, April 17). Campus hate crimes continue to spread. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/campus/campus-hate-crimes-continue-to-spread-1.2850251>
- Cowan, G., & Mettrick, J. (2002). The effects of target variables and setting on perceptions of hate speech. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 32(2), 277-299.
- Cowan, G., Resendez, M., Marshall, E., & Quist, R. (2002). Hate speech and constitutional protection: Priming values of equality and freedom. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(2), 247-263. doi: 10.1111/1540-4560.00259
- Crisan-Vandeborne, L. (2012, October 15). *Common data set 2012-2013* (Publication). Retrieved http://oaa.osu.edu/irp/publisher_surveys/IRP_2013_Survey_Main.pdf
- Dickter, C. L. (2012). Confronting Hate: Confronting hate: Heterosexuals' responses to anti-gay comments. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 59(8), 1113-1130. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2012.712817
- Essig, C. (2012a, April 5). Protesters attend board of trustees meeting, demand action. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/protesters-attend-board-of-trustees-meeting-demand-action-1.2841453>
- Essig, C. (2012b, April 16). Task force formed in response to hate crimes. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/campus/task-force-formed-in-response-to-hate-crimes-1.2848774>

- Gateways. (n.d.). *Office of International Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.oie.ohio-state.edu/gateways.html>
- Hatfield, K. L., Schafer, K., & Stroup, K. A. (2005). A dialogic approach to combating hate speech on college campuses. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 13(1), 41-55. doi: 10.1207/s15456889ajc1301_3
- Jones, C. J. (2012, January 25). The last 48 hours: Islamophobia and the lantern's anti-muslim ad in context. *The Pulse*. Retrieved from <http://thepulse-mag.org/2012/01/lanternad/>
- Lantern Staff. (2012, January 24). Lantern staff prides itself on diversity, dialogue [Editorial]. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/2.1237/editorial-lantern-staff-prides-itself-on-diversity-dialogue-1.2750037>
- The Ohio State University's Muslim Student Association. (2012, October 28). Letter to the editor: Apology for ad demanded. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/opinion/letter-to-the-editor-apology-for-ad-demanded-1.2938728>
- Sheikh, A. (2012a, April 5). Vandalism painted on mural of Obama near Ohio State's campus. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/vandalism-painted-on-mural-of-obama-near-ohio-state-s-campus-1.2841467>
- Sheikh, A. (2012b, January 24). Lantern not 'anti-Islam' despite ad. *The Lantern*. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/2.1237/lantern-not-anti-islam-despite-ad-1.2750050>
- Spencer, E. (2012a, April 9). "OSU stand your ground": Students demand change after hate crimes. *The Pulse*. Retrieved from <http://thepulse-mag.org/2012/04/osu-stand-your-ground-students-demand-change-after-hate-crimes/>

Spencer, E. (2012b, October 24). The lantern prints ad that calls Iranians and muslims “crazies”.

The Pulse. Retrieved from <http://thepulse-mag.org/2012/10/the-lantern-prints-ad-that-calls-iranians-and-muslims-crazies/>

Williams, H. (2012, August 31). Social media exposes Internet hate speech at Ohio State. *The*

Lantern. Retrieved from <http://www.thelantern.com/campus/social-media-exposes-internet-hate-speech-at-ohio-state-1.2889977#.UEDbp6TyZdS>